



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,292	02/06/2002	Toshikazu Hirota	789 076	9651
25191	7590	07/29/2005	EXAMINER	
BURR & BROWN PO BOX 7068 SYRACUSE, NY 13261-7068			LAM, ANN Y	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1641

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/068,292	HIROTA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ann Y. Lam	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7-32 and 58-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-32 and 58-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-32 and 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 is vague. The claim is incomplete. The claimed method is for producing a biochip but the only method step recited in the body of the claim is a "supplying" step. The body of the claim does not recite sufficient steps to form a biochip.

Claims 7-32 are vague and confusing in reciting the term "sample". The art accepted definition of "sample" is a solution that contains an unknown/analyte that is to be detected or quantitated. The method of claims 7-32 is for production of a biochip. Using a "sample" solution containing an analyte to make a biochip doesn't make sense.

In claim 7, line 4, what "types" of samples are being referred to?

Claim 7, last 2 lines, recite "a solution sample containing no capture". What is being claimed (water, buffer, saline)?

Claims 13 and 14 are vague since they recite that the sample containing the capture is supplied before or after the immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution is supplied, which contradicts claim 11, from which claims 13 and 14

depend, because claim 11 recites mixing the immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution with the solution sample containing the capture, which implies that the solutions are applied simultaneously.

Claims 31 and 32 are vague since claim 31, line 5 and claim 32, line 5, recite "solution sample containing no capture" is a repetition of line 3 in the claims. (It appears that it should read --solution sample containing capture--, as is described in the specification.)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 7-9, 11-19, 21-23, 25-31, 58, 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al., 6,476,215.

As to claim 7, Okamoto et al. discloses a method for producing a biochip comprising a large number of spots based on samples containing captures, said spots being arranged on the upper surface of a substantially planar based plate (103) by supplying a solution sample containing capture (i.e., DNA probes in col. 28, line 4, and lines 23-29; and col. 24, line 61- 5) and a solution sample containing no capture (i.e.,

Art Unit: 1641

silane compound in col. 27, lines 40-54) separately from each other to produce the biochip (col. 27, lines 46-47, and col. 28, lines 27-29.)

As to claim 8, the sample containing capture is supplied with an ink-jet system (col. 28, lines 27-29, and col. 24, line 61).

As to claim 9, the sample containing no capture is supplied in accordance with an ink-jet system (col. 27, lines 46-55, and col. 24, line 61.)

As to claim 11, the solution sample containing no capture (e.g., amino or epoxy group in col. 13, lines 38-39) is an immobilization solution for immobilizing said captures onto said base plate or an immobilization-reinforcing solution for reinforcing immobilization of said captures onto said base plate (col. 5, lines 40-41, and col. 6, lines 58-61).

As to claim 12, the immobilization solution or the immobilization-reinforcing solution is advanced by mixing the immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution with the solution sample containing the capture (col. 5, lines 45-48, and col. 16, lines 50-51, and col. 8, lines 15-16.)

As to claim 13, the solution sample containing said capture is supplied onto said base plate, and then said immobilization-reinforcing solution (i.e., ethanol amine, col., 13, line 27) is supplied to parts to which said sample has been supplied (col. 13, lines 25-27.)

As to claim 14, the immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution (i.e., the silane coupling agent, col. 28, line 40) is supplied onto said base plate, and then said solution sample containing said capture is supplied to parts to which said

immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution has been supplied (col. 28, lines 25-27.)

As to claim 15, the immobilization solution or immobilization-reinforcing solution (i.e., the thiol group, col. 5, line 57) and the solution sample containing said capture (i.e., the nucleic acid probe, col. 5, line 56) are supplied substantially simultaneously onto said base plate (col. 5, lines 56-60.)

As to claim 16, the captures are nucleic acids (col. 5, line 56).

As to claim 17, the nucleic acid is DNA (col. 16, line 50.)

As to claim 18, the captures are proteins (col. 10, line 55.)

As to claim 19, the protein is antibody (col. 10, line 55.)

As to claims 21, 58, the immobilization solution is a silane coupling agent, such as  $\gamma$ -aminopropyltriethoxysilane (col. 27, lines 40-41.)

As to claim 22, the immobilization solution includes a chemical substance for chemically modifying a base plate surface, and a functional group introduced into said base plate surface and a functional group introduced by modifying said capture are subjected to a chemical reaction to immobilize said capture onto said base plate by means of covalent bond (col. 7, lines 1-3.)

As to claim 23, the chemical reaction is a reaction of an amino group and epoxy group (col. 6, lines 60-62.)

As to claim 25, the immobilization solution is a solution containing hydrophobic group (i.e., epoxy group, col. 13, lines 24-26.)

As to Claims 26-29, since the immobilization-reinforcing solution was recited in the alternative (see claim 11), these claims are anticipated by the disclosure of the immobilization solution (i.e., epoxy group, col. 6, line 60.)

As to claim 30, the method further comprises preparing a jig (125, see col. 11, line 25) to which a plurality of said base plates (exposed surfaces of 103, see fig. 5B) are set, and the solution sample containing said capture and the solution sample containing no capture are supplied in a state in which said base plates are fixed on said jig.

As to claim 31, Examiner notes that since claim 31 is vague as described in the 112 rejection above, for purposes of examination Examiner will interpret claim 31, line 5, as if Applicant intended to mean --solution sample containing capture--. Okamoto et al. discloses an area in which said solution sample containing no capture is supplied is substantially the same as an area to which said solution sample containing capture is supplied, or an area which includes said area to which said solution sample containing said capture is supplied (col. 7, lines 40-54), said area having a substantially circular shape (col. 5, line 23.)

As to claim 59, the immobilization solution is an alkyl group (col. 7, lines 20-24.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1641

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215.

(Examiner notes that since claim 32 is vague as described in the 112 rejection above, for purposes of examination Examiner will interpret claim 32, line 5, as if Applicant intended to mean –solution sample containing capture--.)

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed, except for the area in which the solution sample containing no capture is supplied onto said base plate, has a size which includes two or more areas to each of which said solution sample containing capture is supplied.

However Okamoto et al. discloses that areas with maleimido groups (equivalent to the claimed sample containing no capture) may be larger than the areas with nucleic acid probes (col. 8, lines 12-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the areas with maleimido groups with a size at least twice as large as the areas with nucleic acid probes because this is an optimum or workable range and it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, as is the case at hand, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233..

2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Robinson et al., 5,856,203.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention as claimed (see above). More specifically, Okamoto et al. teaches that the solution sample containing no capture is supplied with ink jet or other types of printing (col. 15, lies 29-31.) However Okamoto et al. does not teach that the solution sample containing no capture is supplied with screen printing system.

Robinson et al. teaches a method of manufacturing an assay device including the step of providing reagents using ink-jet printing or screen printing (col. 5, lines 8-11.) Robinson et al. teaches that ink-jet printing and screen printing are conventional printing methods that can be used alternatively (col. 5, lines 8-11.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use screen printing as an alternative to the ink jet printing as taught by Robinson et al. in the Okamoto et al. method of supplying the solution sample containing no capture onto the base plate because Robinson et al. teaches that screen printing is a conventional alternative to ink jet printing for supplying reagents to a solid support.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Hammond et al., 6,255,051.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. More specifically, Okamoto et al. discloses use of functional groups introduced into the solid support and into the probe to form covalent bonds to more firmly fix the probe to the

solid support (col. 7, lines 1-4.) However Okamoto et al. does not teach the use of ionic bonds to fix the probe to the solid support.

Hammond et al. teaches that, in addition to functional groups providing covalent bonds between nucleic acids and a solid support, ionic interactions can also facilitate immobilization of nucleic acids onto a solid support (col. 18, lines 8-14 and lines 19-20.) Hammond et al. teaches that the binding can be direct as between the nucleic acid and solid support, or indirect such that an intermediate molecule lies between the nucleic acid and the solid support (col. 18, lines 21-23.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide for ionic bonds between the nucleic acids and the solid support as taught by Hammond et al. in the Okamoto et al. device because Hammond et al. teaches that providing for ionic bonds is an alternative to providing for covalent bonds to immobilize nucleic acids onto a solid support.

4. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Dattagupta, 4,950,588.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. More specifically, Okamoto et al. discloses use of functional groups introduced into the solid support and into the probe to form covalent bonds to more firmly fix the probe to the solid support (col. 7, lines 1-4.) However Okamoto et al. does not teach that the immobilization solution includes avidin.

Dattagupta teaches that, in addition to functional groups providing covalent bonds between nucleic acids and a solid support, the bonding between the nucleic acid and solid support can be through use of avidin as a linker (col. 18, lines 1-12, and col. 19, line 4.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use avidin as a linker between the nucleic acids and the solid support as taught by Dattagupta in the Okamoto et al. device because Dattagupta teaches that use of avidin is an alternative to providing for covalent bonds to immobilize nucleic acids onto a solid support.

5. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Sakamoto et al., 6,406,898.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see above with respect to claims 7, 11, 14 and 28). Okamoto discloses a coupling agent to couple probes such as enzymes, antibodies and nucleic acids, to a solid support (see for example, col. 10, lines 48-65, and col. 12, lines 41-43 and col. 27, lines 40-54). However, Okamoto et al. does not specifically list alginic acid as an example of a coupling agent. Sakamoto et al. discloses this limitation however.

Sakamoto et al. teaches that alginic acid is known to immobilize enzymes (col. 12, line 56 – col. 13, line 5.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide alginic acid as the coupling agent for

the enzyme in the Okamoto et al. invention because Sakamoto et al. teaches that alginic acid is a known coupling agent for enzymes, as would be desirable for the immobilization step in Okamoto et al.

6. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Schwartz, 5,789,261.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see above with respect to claims 7, 11, 14 and 28). Okamoto discloses a coupling agent to couple probes such as antibodies and nucleic acids, to a solid support (see for example, col. 10, lines 48-65, and col. 12, lines 41-43 and col. 27, lines 40-54). However, Okamoto et al. does not specifically list polyethyleneimine as an example of a coupling agent. Schwartz discloses this limitation however.

Schwartz teaches that polyethyleneimine is a covalent coupling agent for an immunoreagent, such as an antibody, to be immobilized on a styrene solid substrate, such as a well, (col. 4, lines 7-29, col. 5, lines 46-49, col. 8, lines 56-61, col. 10, lines 15-29) Schwartz teaches that when an antibody is covalently attached to a solid surface, the reproducibility of an assay increases because the antibodies are less at risk of being displaced by fibrinogen (col. 4, lines 7-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide polyethyleneimine as taught by Schwartz in the Okamoto invention in order to covalently attach antibodies to the surface of the wells because Schwartz teaches that covalent attachment of antibodies to the solid surface provides

Art Unit: 1641

the advantage of increasing reproducibility of an assay by decreasing the risk of antibody displacement by fibrinogen.

7. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Wei et al., 6,576,419.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see above with respect to claims 7, 11, 14 and 28). Okamoto discloses a coupling agent to couple probes such as antibodies and nucleic acids, to a solid support (see for example, col. 10, lines 48-65, and col. 12, lines 41-43 and col. 27, lines 40-54). However, Okamoto et al. does not specifically list polyethylene glycol (PEG) as an example of a coupling agent. Wei et al. discloses this limitation however

Wei et al. teaches that polyethylene glycol can be used to attach oligonucleotides to a solid surface for assay purposes (col. 7, lines 48-57.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide polyethylene glycol as the coupling agent in the Okamoto et al. invention because Wei et al. teaches that polyethylene glycol provides the advantage of coupling DNA to a solid support, such as that in Okamoto et al..

8. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., 6,476,215, in view of Lopez et al., 5,183,735.

Okamoto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see above with respect to claims 7, 11, 14 and 28). Okamoto discloses a coupling agent to couple probes such as antibodies and nucleic acids, to a solid support (see for example, col.

10, lines 48-65, and col. 12, lines 41-43 and col. 27, lines 40-54). However, Okamoto et al. does not specifically list BSA (bovine serum albumin) as an example of a coupling agent. Lopez et al. discloses this limitation however.

Lopez et al. teaches using BSA as a coating on a solid support such as microwells to enhance adherence of DNA to polystyrene wells and to eliminate false positives due to the binding of anti-histone antibodies, which provides a consistently high level of reproducibility of assays (col. 4, lines 20-43.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide BSA as the coupling agent in the Okamoto et al. invention because Lopez et al. teaches that such a coupling agent provides the advantage of enhancing adherence of DNA to the wells and eliminating false positives, thereby providing high levels of reproducibility of assays, as would be desirable in the Okamoto et al. invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed April 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Okamoto fails to disclose a substantially planar base plate. The Office maintains that plate (103) in Okamoto, forming part of the wells, is a planar base plate, and has spots arranged on it as claimed.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Sat 11-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.L.



LONG V. LE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

